THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. RAMULU

WRIT PETITION No.13193 OF 1999

DATED: 07.11.2007

Between:

Dr P. Pushpa Rani

.. Petitioner

And

Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswa Vidyalayam, Tirupathi rep. by its Registrar and another.

.. Respondents

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. RAMULU

WRIT PETITION No.13193 OF 1999

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a Mandamus declaring the action of the 1st respondent in ignoring the petitioner and appointing the 2nd respondent as Lecturer in Sericulture, pursuant to the notification dated 20.04.1999, as arbitrary and illegal; and consequently to direct the 1st respondent to appoint the petitioner as Lecturer in Sericulture.

It appears, in pursuance of the notification issued by the 1st respondent University on 20.04.1999 inviting applications from the eligible female candidates for recruitment to the post of Readers and Lecturers in different faculties, the petitioner as well as the 2nd respondent applied for the post of Lecturer in Sericulture and interview was held on 19.06.1999 by the selection committee. While so, the grievance of the petitioner is that though she is fully qualified and eligible to hold the post of Lecturer in Sericulture, the 1st respondent University, ignoring her case, issued appointment order to the 2nd respondent, who do not possess the required qualification of N.E.T. or Ph.D. in Sericulture.

Though interim suspension of the appointment of the 2nd

respondent was granted by this Court on 20.07.1999 while admitting the writ petition, the same was set aside by the Division Bench of this Court on 03.09.1999, vide order in W.A.No.1266 of 1999 filed by the 2nd respondent. Thus, it must be deemed that the 2nd respondent is continuing in service.

The learned counsel for the 2nd respondent has placed a memo before this Court stating that the services of the 2nd respondent in the post of Associate Professor in Sericulture were confirmed by the 1st respondent University with effect from 12.11.2001 and thereafter she was also promoted to senior scale grade with effect from 22.06.2005. The 1st respondent University also, in the counter filed by it, has categorically asserted that though the petitioner appeared for interview along with the 2nd respondent, she could not come up for selection since she had no requisite qualification of teaching experience. It is also interesting to notice that selection committee was not made a party to these proceedings.

For all the above reasons, I am of the opinion that the writ petition is devoid of merits and is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

C.V.RAMULU, J

7th November, 2007
IBL